APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/713,600	11/15/2000	Harold Kraft	61000/101	9771

7590 10/03/2007	EXAMINER
NIXON PEABODY LLP	LE, MIRANDA
Clinton Square	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square
P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, NY 14603

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10-20,22-32,34-49,51 and 53* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-49, 51, 53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/12/2007 has been entered.

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 07/12/2007.

2.   Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-49, 51, 53 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25,

49, 51, 53 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 1,10-12, 22-25, 34-36, 49, 51, 53

have been amended.   This action is made non-Final.

3.   The objection to the specification (claim objection) of the invention has been withdrawn

in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. · In considering patentability of the
claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various
claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any
evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out
the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 6-8, 11, 13, 18-20, 23, 25, 30-32, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43-45 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (US Patent No. 6,581,056), in view of Anderson et

al. (US Patent No. 6,005,860).

As per claim 1, Rao teaches a method for retrieving data, comprising:

selecting one of plurality of user input *(i.e. a query to one or more information sources,*

e.g. databases, col. 2, lines 9-26);

determining which of two or more different types of communication medium *(i.e.*

Connection to the information sources may be through a network, e.g. databases residing on the

Internet, or via a direct connection to the communication source, e.g. direct dial-up to

Dialog.TM. Information Source databases, col. 3, lines 35-42) can be used to access at least one

of a plurality of electronic records databases associated with the selected one of the electronic

records search requests *(i.e. Each of the information sources 102 manage a repository of*

information (e.g. collections of papers, articles or other document types) and provide access to it

through some access protocol. The access protocol may be either one of the de facto standards

(e.g. Z39.50) or a server specific protocol (e.g. as used in the Dialog.TM. On-line information

source). Thus, the IA client is capable of communicating using the protocol of the server, col. 3,

lines 52-59);

retrieving instructions *(i.e. The intermediary server relays the operation requests to the*

information sources using the protocol of the information sources, col. 4, lines 5-17) for

accessing the at least one of a plurality of electronic records databases *(i.e. The query translation*

part 404 processes a query into the protocol(s) utilized by each of the various information

sources being accessed. The query translation part 404 may also modify the query for a

particular information source in the event that the information source cannot support the

original request (e.g. a request made that is restricted to a particular field), col. 5, lines 31-37)

based on at least one of the determined types of communication medium which can be used to

access the at least one of the plurality of electronic records databases *(i.e. each of the various*

information sources may communicate using a different protocol and each may have different

search capabilities, col. 4, lines 20-40);

accessing the at least one of the plurality of electronic records databases with the

retrieved instructions *(i.e. In this step any necessary protocol conversions are performed along*

with any modifications for a particular information source that are necessary in order to make a

"best effort" to perform the query as requested. After some period of time the results of the query

to the information sources are returned and collected by the IA client, step 303. In this case the

entire documents may be downloaded, so what is obtained is a whole collection of full text

documents, col. 4, lines 20-40);

executing the selected electronic records search request and retrieving at least one

electronic record from at least one storage location during the executing *(i.e. In any event, what*

the user now has is an ephemeral collection of documents that have been gathered from multiple

information sources, col. 4, lines 20-40);

parsing the electronic records *(i.e. The tokenizer 502 extracts tokens by parsing the text of*

a document and generating a token 503 for each contiguous sequence of characters (e.g. a

word). The tokens are then processed through a series of filters 504, col. 6, lines 18-36) to

convert one or more raw data sets into user-selectable objects *(i.e. after going through the series*

of filters 504 the remaining tokens 505 that are output are input to a statistics collector 506 for

collecting the document level statistics 507 and collection level statistics 508. These statistics

may include token occurrences or proximity of words or phrases, col. 6, lines 18-36, col. 4, lines

41-54); and

causing the user-selectable objects to be displayed *(i.e. In relevance feedback a user*

indicates documents in the ephemeral collection that are relevant. Typically, an automatic

procedure is used to reweight, add, or remove terms in a subsequent query (although some

systems permit this to be done by the user), col. 6, lines 60-64).

Rao does not specifically teach stored electronic records search requests from a queued

search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria.

Anderson teaches stored electronic records search requests *(i.e. a search request, col. 17,*

lines 27-35) from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection

criteria *(i.e. At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's queue.*

In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a FIFO (first

in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at the bottom

position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from the top

position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the destination

module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a designated position,

such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao

and Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao to include the

limitations as taught by Anderson. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

this combination in order to monitor the contents of the destination module's queue for pending

router packets, and monitor the designated destination module for processing activity in view of

Anderson (col. 17, lines 46-54), as doing so would give the added benefit of having an

information retrieval system to adaptively routed the information to another software module

called the destination module, as taught by Anderson (col. 3, lines 23-35).

As per claim 13, Rao teaches a system for retrieving data, comprising:

at least one station operatively connected to at least one storage location *(Fig. 2); and*

at least one processor operatively connected to the at least one station and the at least one

storage location *(Fig. 2)*, the at least one processor executing a program of instructions for

selecting one of a plurality of user input *(i.e. the query translated and transmitted to the*

respective information sources, col. 2. lines 27-36), determining which of two or more different

types of communication medium can be used to access at least one electronic records database

associated with the selected one of the electronic records search requests *(i.e. Connection to the*

information sources may be through a network, e.g. databases residing on the Internet, or via a

direct connection to the communication source, e.g. direct dial-up to Dialog.TM. Information

Source databases, col. 3, lines 35-42), retrieving instruction for accessing the at least one

electronic records search requests *(i.e. Each of the information sources 102 manage a repository*

of information (e.g. collections of papers, articles or other document types) and provide access

to it through some access protocol. The access protocol may be either one of the de facto

standards (e.g. Z39.50) or a server specific protocol (e.g. as used in the Dialog.TM. On-line

information source). Thus, the IA client is capable of communicating using the protocol of the

server, col. 3, lines 52-59), retrieving instructions for accessing the at least one electronic records

database based on at least one of the determined types of communication medium which can be

used to access the at least one electronic records database *(i.e. The query translation part 404*

processes a query into the protocol(s) utilized by each of the various information sources being

accessed. The query translation part 404 may also modify the query for a particular information

source in the event that the information source cannot support the original request (e.g. a

request made that is restricted to a particular field), col. 5, lines 31-37), accessing the at least

one electronic records database with the retrieved instructions *(i.e. In this step any necessary*

protocol conversions are performed along with any modifications for a particular information

source that are necessary in order to make a "best effort" to perform the query as requested.

After some period of time the results of the query to the information sources are returned and

collected by the IA client, step 303. In this case the entire documents may be downloaded, so

what is obtained is a whole collection of full text documents, col. 4, lines 20-40), executing the

selected electronic records search request and retrieving at least one electronic record from the at

least one storage location during the executing *(i.e. In any event, what the user now has is an*

ephemeral collection of documents that have been gathered from multiple information sources,

col. 4, lines 20-40), parsing the electronic records *(i.e. The tokenizer 502 extracts tokens by*

parsing the text of a document and generating a token 503 for each contiguous sequence of

characters (e.g. a word). The tokens are then processed through a series of filters 504, col. 6,

lines 18-36) to convert one or more raw data sets into user-selectable objects *(i.e. after going*

through the series of filters 504 the remaining tokens 505 that are output are input to a statistics

collector 506 for collecting the document level statistics 507 and collection level statistics 508.

These statistics may include token occurrences or proximity of words or phrases, col. 6, lines 18-

36, col. 4, lines 41-54), and causing the user-selectable objects to be displayed *(i.e. In relevance*

feedback a user indicates documents in the ephemeral collection that are relevant. Typically, an

automatic procedure is used to reweight, add, or remove terms in a subsequent query (although

some systems permit this to be done by the user), col. 6, lines 60-64).

Rao does not explicitly teach stored electronic records search request from a queued

search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria.

Anderson teaches stored electronic records search requests *(i.e. a search request, col. 17,*

lines 27-35) from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection

criteria *(i.e. At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's queue.*

In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a FIFO (first

in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at the bottom

position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from the top

position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the destination

module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a designated position,

such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao

and Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao to include the

limitations as taught by Anderson. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

this combination in order to monitor the contents of the destination module's queue for pending

router packets, and monitor the designated destination module for processing activity in view of

Anderson (col. 17, lines 46-54), as doing so would give the added benefit of having an

information retrieval system to adaptively routed the information to another software module

called the destination module as taught by Anderson (col. 3, lines 23-35).

As per claim 25, Rao teaches a program storage device readable by a machine tangibly

embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for

accessing electronic records obtained from at least one electronic records dataset search, the

method enabling users to select for retrieval at least one raw data set related to the electronic

records, the device comprising:

selecting one of a plurality of user input *(i.e. the query translated and transmitted to the*

respective information sources, col. 2. lines 27-36);

executing the selected electronic records search request and retrieving at least one

electronic record from at least one storage location during the executing *(i.e. In any event, what*

the user now has is an ephemeral collection of documents that have been gathered from multiple

information sources, col. 4, lines 20-40);

determining which of two or more different types of communication medium *(i.e.*

Connection to the information sources may be through a network, e.g. databases residing on the

Internet, or via a direct connection to the communication source, e.g. direct dial-up to

Dialog.TM. Information Source databases, col. 3, lines 35-42) can be used to access at least one

of a plurality of electronic records databases associated with the selected one of the electronic

records search request *(i.e. Each of the information sources 102 manage a repository of*

information (e.g. collections of papers, articles or other document types) and provide access to it

through some access protocol. The access protocol may be either one of the de facto standards

(e.g. Z39.50) or a server specific protocol (e.g. as used in the Dialog.TM. On-line information

source). Thus, the IA client is capable of communicating using the protocol of the server, col. 3,

lines 52-59); retrieving instructions for accessing the at least one of a plurality of electronic

records databases based on at least one of the determined types of communication medium which

can be used to access the at least one of the plurality of electronic records databases *(i.e. The*

query translation part 404 processes a query into the protocol(s) utilized by each of the various

information sources being accessed. The query translation part 404 may also modify the query

for a particular information source in the event that the information source cannot support the

original request (e.g. a request made that is restricted to a particular field), col. 5, lines 31-37);

accessing the at least one of the plurality of electronic records databases with the

retrieved instructions *(i.e. In any event, what the user now has is an ephemeral collection of*

documents that have been gathered from multiple information sources, col. 4, lines 20-40);

retrieving at least one electronic record from at least one storage location *(i.e. In this step*

any necessary protocol conversions are performed along with any modifications for a particular

information source that are necessary in order to make a "best effort" to perform the query as

requested. After some period of time the results of the query to the information sources are

returned and collected by the IA client, step 303. In this case the entire documents may be

downloaded, so what is obtained is a whole collection of full text documents, col. 4, lines 20-40);

parsing the electronic records *(i.e. The tokenizer 502 extracts tokens by parsing the text of*

a document and generating a token 503 for each contiguous sequence of characters (e.g. a

word). The tokens are then processed through a series of filters 504, col. 6, lines 18-36) to

convert one or more raw data sets into user-selectable objects *(i.e. after going through the series*

of filters 504 the remaining tokens 505 that are output are input to a statistics collector 506 for

collecting the document level statistics 507 and collection level statistics 508. These statistics

may include token occurrences or proximity of words or phrases, col. 6, lines 18-36, col. 4, lines

41-54); and

causing the user-selectable objects to be displayed *(i.e. In relevance feedback a user*

indicates documents in the ephemeral collection that are relevant. Typically, an automatic

procedure is used to reweight, add, or remove terms in a subsequent query (although some

systems permit this to be done by the user), col. 6, lines 60-64).

Rao does not explicitly teach stored electronic records search requests from a queued

search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria.

Anderson teaches stored electronic records search requests *(i.e. a search request, col. 17,*

lines 27-35) from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection

criteria *(i.e. At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's queue.*

In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a FIFO (first

in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at the bottom

position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from the top

position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the destination

module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a designated position,

such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao

and Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao to include the

limitations as taught by Anderson. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

this combination in order to monitor the contents of the destination module's queue for pending

router packets, and monitor the designated destination module for processing activity in view of

Anderson (col. 17, lines 46-54), as doing so would give the added benefit of having an

information retrieval system to adaptively routed the information to another software module

called the destination module as taught by Anderson (col. 3, lines 23-35).

As to claims 6, 18, 30, Rao teaches the parsing is implemented by at least one data

processing algorithm based substantially on artificial intelligence *(i.e. The tokenizer 502 extracts*

tokens by parsing the text of a document and generating a token 503 for each contiguous

sequence of characters (e.g. a word). The tokens are then processed through a series of filters

504, col. 6, lines 18-36).

As to claims 7, 19, 31, Rao teaches the parsing further comprises: determining at least

one data parsing algorithm that should be used for parsing the retrieved electronic records based

upon a content of the retrieved electronic records; and executing the parsing using the at least

one determining data parsing algorithm *(i.e. The tokenizer 502 extracts tokens by parsing the text*

of a document and generating a token 503 for each contiguous sequence of characters (e.g. a

word). The tokens are then processed through a series of filters 504, col. 6, lines 18-36).

As to claims 8, 20, 32, Rao teaches the parsing further comprises filtering, sorting or

analyzing the received electronic records for data consistency *(i.e. after going through the series*

of filters 504 the remaining tokens 505 that are output are input to a statistics collector 506 for

collecting the document level statistics 507 and collection level statistics 508. These statistics

may include token occurrences or proximity of words or phrases, col. 6, lines 18-36, col. 4, lines

41-54).

As to claims 11, 23, 35, Rao teaches the first communication medium comprises a

telephone dial-up modem connection and the second communication medium comprises an

Internet connection *(i.e. Connection to the information sources may be through a network, e.g.*

databases residing on the Internet, or via a direct connection to the communication source, e.g.

direct dial-up to Dialog.TM. Information Source databases, col. 3, lines 35-42).

As to claims 37, 39, 41, Rao teaches the selecting one of the plurality of electronic

records search requests to execute next base upon the one or more selection criteria further

comprises examining search data associated with each of the electronic records search requests

and evaluating the search data using the one or more selection criteria *(i.e. In relevance feedback*

a user indicates documents in the ephemeral collection that are relevant. Typically, an automatic

procedure is used to reweight, add, or remove terms in a subsequent query (although some

systems permit this to be done by the user), col. 6, lines 60-64).

As to claims 43, 44, 45, Anderson teaches one or more of the stored search requests are

stored in a search database when the search request cannot be executed at the time the search

request is made *(i.e. At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's*

queue. In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a

FIFO (first in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at

the bottom position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from

the top position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the

destination module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a

designated position, such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

6.   Claims 38, 40, 42, 49, 51, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Rao (US Patent No. 6,581,056), in view of Anderson et al. (US Patent No. 6,005,860), and

further in view of Ferrel et al. (US Patent No. 5,907,837).

As to claim 49, 51, Rao teaches a method for determining which of a plurality of search

requests to implement, the method comprising:

evaluating one or more user input *(i.e. the query translated and transmitted to the*

respective information sources, col. 2. lines 27-36), electronic records search requests using two

or more search selection criteria *(i.e. Each of the information sources 102 manage a repository*

of information (e.g. collections of papers, articles or other document types) and provide access

to it through some access protocol. The access protocol may be either one of the de facto

standards (e.g. Z39.50) or a server specific protocol (e.g. as used in the Dialog.TM. On-line

information source). Thus, the IA client is capable of communicating using the protocol of the

server, col. 3, lines 52-59), wherein the one or more search selection criteria comprises a status

of the examined electronic records search request *(i.e. information describing the available*

information sources, col. 4, lines 5-17);

selecting one of the user input, electronic records search requests to execute next based

upon the evaluation *(i.e. The query translation part 404 processes a query into the protocol(s)*

utilized by each of the various information sources being accessed. The query translation part

404 may also modify the query for a particular information source in the event that the

information source cannot support the original request (e.g. a request made that is restricted to

a particular field), col. 5, lines 31-37); and

executing the selected search *(i.e. In this step any necessary protocol conversions are*

performed along with any modifications for a particular information source that are necessary

in order to make a "best effort" to perform the query as requested. After some period of time the

results of the query to the information sources are returned and collected by the IA client, step

303. In this case the entire documents may be downloaded, so what is obtained is a whole

collection of full text documents, col. 4, lines 20-40).

Rao does not specifically teach a plurality of queued search requests.

Anderson teaches a plurality of queued search requests *(i.e. a search request, col. 17,*

lines 27-35; At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's queue.

In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a FIFO (first

in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at the bottom

position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from the top

position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the destination

module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a designated position,

such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao

and Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao to include the

limitations as taught by Anderson. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

this combination in order to monitor the contents of the destination module's queue for pending

router packets, and monitor the designated destination module for processing activity in view of

Anderson (col. 17, lines 46-54), as doing so would give the added benefit of having an

information retrieval system adaptively routed the information to another software module called

the destination module as taught by Anderson (col. 3, lines 23-35).

Rao, Anderson do not expressly teach the examined electronic records search request was

last updated.

Ferrel teaches when the examined electronic records search request was last updated (i.e.

content object modification date, col. 26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Ferrel at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson

to include the examined electronic records search request was last updated as taught by Ferrel.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to

determine how the search object results are sorted for the current section in view of Ferrel (col.

26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14), as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a system

and method for indexing structured titles and search objects which would be an advance in the

industry, as taught by Ferrel (col. 3, lines 61-65).

As to claim 53, Rao teaches a system for determining which of a plurality of search

requests to implement, the system comprising:

a search evaluation system that evaluates one or more user input *(i.e. the query translated

and transmitted to the respective information sources, col. 2. lines 27-36)*, electronic records

search requests using two or more search selection criteria *(i.e. Each of the information sources*

102 manage a repository of information (e.g. collections of papers, articles or other document

types) and provide access to it through some access protocol. The access protocol may be either

one of the de facto standards (e.g. Z39.50) or a server specific protocol (e.g. as used in the

Dialog.TM. On-line information source). Thus, the IA client is capable of communicating using

the protocol of the server, col. 3, lines 52-59), wherein the one or more search selection criteria

comprises a status of the examined electronic records search request *(i.e. information describing*

the available information sources, col. 4, lines 5-17);

a search selection system that selects one of the user input, electronic records search

requests to execute next based upon the evaluation *(i.e. The query translation part 404 processes*

a query into the protocol(s) utilized by each of the various information sources being accessed.

The query translation part 404 may also modify the query for a particular information source in

the event that the information source cannot support the original request (e.g. a request made

that is restricted to a particular field), col. 5, lines 31-37); and

a search execution system that executes the selected search *(i.e. In this step any necessary*

protocol conversions are performed along with any modifications for a particular information

source that are necessary in order to make a "best effort" to perform the query as requested.

After some period of time the results of the query to the information sources are returned and

collected by the IA client, step 303. In this case the entire documents may be downloaded, so

what is obtained is a whole collection of full text documents, col. 4, lines 20-40).

Rao does not specifically teach a plurality of queued search requests.

Anderson teaches a plurality of queued search requests *(i.e. a search request, col. 17,*

lines 27-35; At step 325, the MRA 38 places the router packet in the destination module's queue.

In embodiments of the present invention, the destination module's queue is typically a FIFO (first

in first out) type of ordered memory structure. A router packet is usually placed at the bottom

position of the queue and the destination module usually retrieves router packets from the top

position of the queue. In this way, if multiple router packets are placed within the destination

module's queue, the earliest router packet to arrive in the queue will be at a designated position,

such as the top position, col. 17, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao

and Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao to include the

limitations as taught by Anderson. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

this combination in order to monitor the contents of the destination module's queue for pending

router packets, and monitor the designated destination module for processing activity in view of

Anderson (col. 17, lines 46-54), as doing so would give the added benefit of having an

information retrieval system adaptively routed the information to another software module called

the destination module as taught by Anderson (col. 3, lines 23-35).

Rao, Anderson do not teach when the examined electronic records search request was last

updated.

Ferrel teaches when the examined electronic records search request was last updated (i.e.

content object modification date, col. 26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Ferrel at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson

to include when the examined electronic records search request was last updated as taught by

Ferrel. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to

determine how the search object results are sorted for the current section in view of Ferrel (col.

26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14), as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a system

and method for indexing structured titles and search objects which would be an advance in the

industry as taught by Ferrel (col. 3, lines 61-65).

As to claims 38, 40, 42, Rao teaches one or more search selection criteria comprises a

status of the examined electronic records search request *(i.e. information describing the available*

information sources, col. 4, lines 5-17).

Rao, Anderson do not teach when the examined electronic records search request was last

updated.

Ferrel teaches when the examined electronic records search request was last updated (i.e.

content object modification date, col. 26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Ferrel at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson

to include when the examined electronic records search request was last updated as taught by

Ferrel. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to

determine how the search object results are sorted for the current section in view of Ferrel (col.

26, line 59 to col. 27, line 14), as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a system

and method for indexing structured titles and search objects which would be an advance in the

industry as taught by Ferrel (col. 3, lines 61-65).

7.   Claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 26, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rao (US Patent No. 6,581,056), in view of Anderson et al. (US Patent No. 6,005,860), and

further in view of Barr et al. (US Patent No. 5,873,076).

As to claims 2, 14, 26, Rao, Anderson do not specifically teach selecting at least one of

the user-selectable objects to retrieve the raw data set associated with the selected object.

Barr teaches this limitation *(i.e. A search result list having entries representative of both*

textual documents and multi-media files related to the single search query is generated in

accordance with the document records and the multi-media records identified by the index

database search. Text corresponding to the search topic is retrieved by selecting entries from the

search result list representing document records to be retrieved, and then retrieving text

represented by the text information fields associated with the selected document records. Digital

video, audio or graphics information corresponding to the search topic is retrieved by selecting

entries from the search result list representing selected multi-media records to be retrieved, and

then retrieving digital video, audio or graphics information represented by multi-media

information fields associated with the selected multi-media records, col. 4, lines 19-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Barr at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson, Rao to

include the limitations as taught by Barr. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

make this combination in order to retrieve text represented by the text information fields

associated with the selected document records in view of Barr (col. 4, lines 19-33), as doing so

would give the added benefit of effectively identifying textual documents and multi-media files

corresponding to a search topic as taught by Barr (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 33).

As to claims 5, 17, 29, Rao, Anderson do not explicitly teach the parsing further

comprises extracting the at least one raw data set from the retrieve electronic records.

Barr teaches this limitation *(i.e. A search result list is then generated having entries*

representative of information files identified during the database search, and the search result

list is displayed in a first display window open on a user display, col. 4, lines 34-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Barr at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson, Rao to

include the limitations as taught by Barr. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

make this combination in order to have a document composition window for receiving portions

of the first and second information files is opened on the user display in view of Barr (col. 4,

lines 34-62), as doing so would give the added benefit of effectively identifying textual

documents and multi-media files corresponding to a search topic as taught by Barr (col. 3, line

60 to col. 4, line 33).

8.   Claims 3, 4, 10, 12, 15, 16, 22, 24, 27, 28, 34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Rao (US Patent No. 6,581,056), in view of Anderson et al. (US Patent

No. 6,005,860), and further in view of Wolfe (US Patent No. 6,263,351).

As to claims 3, 15, 27, Rao, Anderson do not teach the raw data sets comprise court case

items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet.

However, Wolfe teaches the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet *(i.e. the Graver Tank case that was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1950, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 63)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao, Anderson and Wolfe at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson to include the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet as taught by Wolfe. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to display at least a portion of a first document and simultaneously displaying a representation of one or more citing documents in view of Wolfe, as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a method and system for efficiently researching interrelated documents as taught by Wolfe (Summary).

As to claims 4, 16, 28, Rao, Anderson do not specifically teach the electronic records comprise results of an executed electronic court case records search request, at least one criterion used in formulating the electronic court case records search request and data related to at least one electronic court database associated with the electronic court case records search request.

However, Wolfe teaches the electronic records comprise results of an executed electronic court case records search request, at least one criterion used in formulating the electronic court case records search request and data related to at least one electronic court database associated with the electronic court case records search request *(i.e. the Graver Tank case that was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1950, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 63)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao, Anderson and Wolfe at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson to include the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet as taught by Wolfe. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to display at least a portion of a first document and simultaneously displaying a representation of one or more citing documents in view of Wolfe, as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a method and system for efficiently researching interrelated documents as taught by Wolfe (Summary).

As to claims 10, 22, 34, Rao teaches the plurality of electronic records databases comprises at least one first electronic database accessible through the first communication medium and at least one second electronic record database accessible through the second communication medium *(i.e. Connection to the information sources may be through a network, e.g. databases residing on the Internet, or via a direct connection to the communication source, e.g. direct dial-up to Dialog.TM. Information Source databases, col. 3, lines 35-42).*

Rao, Anderson do not expressly teach court database.

However, Wolfe teaches court database *(i.e. the Graver Tank case that was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1950, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 63).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao, Anderson and Wolfe at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson to include the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet as taught by Wolfe. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this

combination in order to display at least a portion of a first document and simultaneously

displaying a representation of one or more citing documents in view of Wolfe, as doing so would

give the added benefit of providing a method and system for efficiently researching interrelated

documents as taught by Wolfe (Summary).

As to claims 12, 24, 36, Rao, Anderson do not expressly teach the electronic records

search requests comprise court case docket sheet search requests *(i.e. the Graver Tank case that*

was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1950, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 63).

However, Wolfe teaches the electronic records search requests comprise court case

docket sheet search requests *(i.e. the Graver Tank case that was decided by the U.S. Supreme*

Court in 1950, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao,

Anderson and Wolfe at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rao, Anderson

to include the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case

docket sheet as taught by Wolfe. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this

combination in order to display at least a portion of a first document and simultaneously

displaying a representation of one or more citing documents in view of Wolfe, as doing so would

give the added benefit of providing a method and system for efficiently researching interrelated

documents as taught by Wolfe (Summary).

9.   Claims 46, 47, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao

(US Patent No. 6,581,056), in view of Anderson et al. (US Patent No. 6,005,860), and further in

view of Kanoh et al. (US Patent No. 5,873,077).

As to claims 46, 47, 48, Rao, Anderson do not specifically teach retrieving one or more hard-copy documents associated with a selected user-selectable object.

Kanoh teaches this limitation *(i.e. The results of the search are returned to the user via the fax machine. These results may include documents that satisfy the search or may include a listing of such documents. Using the present invention, the user may also select documents from the search results to be retrieved from the Web using the fax machine, col. 4, lines 22-43).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Rao, Anderson and Kanoh at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson, Rao to include retrieving one or more hard-copy documents associated with a selected user-selectable object as taught by Kanoh. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to select documents from the search results to be retrieved from the Web in view of Kanoh (col. 4, lines 22-43), as doing so would give the added benefit of allowing a fax machine to act as a Web client and retrieve text and images from any Web site as taught by Kanoh (col. 4, lines 43-47).

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-49, 51, 53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Miranda Le
September 25, 2007